

*Safety
Last*

of a Means or Needs Test was duly administered to public opinion, though only after its conditions as first projected had been drastically revised in consequence of protests from quarters unappreciative of its tonic qualities.

This victory for economy was offset by a slight reverse. Judges continued to profess *a reasoned scepticism as to the competence of recent legislation, aimed at reducing the salaries of public servants, to affect the remuneration of our Judicial Bench/ Nor did their cause go unchampioned. Professor Holdsworth, for instance, expressed the view that .£5,000 a year subject to taxation was 'not sufficient to induce the ablest lawyers in the prime of life to accept judicial office'; and the ingenious argument was used that since judges have every year to try 'many cases which involve enormous amounts of money', and since 'a wrong decision in any one of these may inflict on a litigant the unmerited sacrifice of a sum which vastly exceeds the annual saving on all judicial salaries', it was, perhaps, ill-advised to make them subject to the cuts imposed on other civil servants. The same argument would seem to apply to porters employed to shift bullion, who might plead, when a reduction in their pay was proposed, that since they had to transport enormous amounts of money, and since any carelessness on their part would involve losses vastly exceeding what would be saved by reducing their pay, it should be left intact. 'A hundred years ago/ a leading article in *The Times* contended, '^5,500 a year tax free was not thought an excessive stipend for a puisne judge. Is it not possible that .£2,500 (which is all judges will receive in the

present year) is too little ?' Apparently it was, for the judges' sufferings were soon cut short, and their full salaries restored. In the controversy which resulted from the attempt to reduce them, it was disclosed that an Attorney-General might expect to earn in fees, refreshers and other emoluments, an annual income of .£44,500, and a Lord Advocate, about .£11,000. These cases, unlike the one of the family of five in receipt of 695. a week unemployment benefit, were not thought to merit the description 'sinister*.

As the National Government settled down to its secure